Comments from individuals that indicated '*Do not support*' or '*Strongly do not support*' the proposed system

• 178 individuals rated the proposed system
• 23 (12.9%) of the ratings were '*Do not support*' or '*Strongly do not support*'
• 22 comments were provided

Exp	Overall Opinion	Additional Comments after reviewing all recommendations and providing an overall opinion
		IHE Role
0	-2	Coming to see people more often adds more stress and more paperwork to a system that requires so much paperwork.
0	-2	I believe that we should leave it as it was. If it isn't broken don't fix it
2	-2	I do not support the new system. It will be burdensome both to the IHE and to the COA. We should be spending our time with the credentialing process rather than more reports.
3	-1	I prefer that we consider the work of our colleagues and be reasonable about the amount of work needed to gather data, write reports, prepare for visits etc. I do not see the need for making the accreditation process more onerous than it already is.
3	-1	Funding and resources need to be provided to universities in order to implement the proposed system.
3	-1	There is no point to increasing the control of ongoing evaluation. It is the professional responsibility of each program sponsor to provide a quality program at all times.
4	-1	Dissolve the commission. Pay institutions or provide additional resources to support any additional reporting or accountability. Quit creating structures to further weigh the pig. Start creating structures to provide incentives for institutional excellence.,.....distinguished schools etc.
4.5	-2	Based on my impressions of costs in terms of human resources and money and time spent, CA accreditation is not cost-effective.
5	-2	There seems to be no understanding of the onerous process that is already in place, and more work for faculties and staffs is being proposed with no resources, thus the long term effects of these proposals is to create even greater layers of bureaucracy that further impede the preparation of our future teachers. If as a faculty member, I have 2 hours, better I spend it meeting with students, revising my courses, course activities and assignments, meet with teachers and administrators in the field, recruit new and diverse potential teachers (especially math/science). It is inconceivable that my filling out more forms, collecting more data, being interviewed more about what I do will help in any way. It will keep me from doing what I was hired to do. It will mean that my courses become more standardize, not more standards driven. And that is not the goal. Our courses must be responsive to the prospective teachers we work with. That is my job. If you want a team to come out and evaluate more often, then they need to be the ones collecting the data. Not me, my staff, my colleagues, or my students. If the COA team was a team of ethnographers who came out to observe and understand the work we are doing, then great. But that is not what is proposed. The brunt must be borne by already impacted and under resourced programs. And that is not in support of California's teachers.
5	-1	I believe that for the most part the current accountability system works. The cycle is effective for most institutions that already have internal systems of accountability. Only if the visit finds a program or institution below the standards should additional reporting be

Comments about proposed system as a whole
Exp= Experience with accreditation
Overall Opinion= rating of the proposed system

Exp	Overall Opinion	Additional Comments after reviewing all recommendations and providing an overall opinion
		necessary.
7	-1	Although I am a strong supporter of accreditation, I am very concerned about the following general provisions:
7	-1	Please consider what you are asking IHE's to do, prepare, etc. While we support accountability, small private universities do not have the people power to generate reports, prepare for more frequent visits or continually revise programs. For example just preparing the new Preliminary Credential document for COA approval last year took over 300 hours of faculty time. We can not afford to devote that much time to document/program reviews!
9.5	-2	As stated previously, I can not support another report that would require a two-year report, beyond what is already being collected by CCTC and the Cal State System. Quality can not be proven in short term numbers.
11.5	-1	On-site visitations are unnecessary. The current Level I and Level II model is flawed and should be revisited. An undergraduate major in Education should be permitted.
11.5	-1	Well, honestly, there wasn't a choice that matched what I truly think about the new proposed system, so I chose "do not support" so that I could write this little paragraph. So - I mostly think reporting something (web based, or site visit) every two years is a bit much. I think if programs are doing their jobs, then a snapshot approach, maybe every 5 years is just fine. If programs do not meet standards, they should then have to submit more data more frequently. But, for institutions that meet all standards, I don't really think more work more frequently will improve their programs (they're probably already doing self-assessment on a regular basis). In addition, all institutions are regionally accredited, and that process is duplicative in some ways to CTC accreditation.
11.5	-2	I do not support the proposed increase paperwork and visitation. I do support the idea of looking at individual programs within an institution, but not strongly.
12.5	-1	There is too much emphasis placed on reporting and too many resources at the local and state levels put into that work.
14	-1	As I have stated earlier in this feedback form, I am very concerned about the mid-point reports. What will they look like? Has the working committee considered the unintended consequences of these additional monitoring systems?
18.5	-2	When considering a new system, I would ask two questions. First, what is not working in the old system? My response is that much is working. The review is comprehensive - it's based on evidence from multiple sources and includes analysis by peers; I think both of those are good things. What's not working? Well, I think the COA is way too political and serves no other meaningful purpose pragmatically. The COA members have no validity as gatekeepers. Also the current system is too punitive and not developmental. However, it can lead to meaningful change. I think it needs to be much more developmental and educational in most cases. The second question is: what would I want in a new system? I would begin by examining the characteristics of what works in education. I would reject the current politically driven "essentialist" educational theory and would consider a more progressive approach. I don't have much faith that stressing "standards," "accountability," and annual data-driven reports will improve teacher education. You might consider another paradigm. Consideration might be given to the possibility that state accreditation typically assumes a "tightly coupled" system. However, at the program level, both K-12 and the university are loosely-coupled systems. Typically, more successful change programs (K-12 or University) are driven by smaller groups of individuals who develop innovative and meaningful programs. I hope any accreditation system will support such an approach by allowing initial experimentation followed by on-going and sustainable development. More specifically, this would probably mean smaller review teams focusing on specific programs with follow-up determined

Comments about proposed system as a whole
Exp= Experience with accreditation
Overall Opinion= rating of the proposed system

Exp	Overall Opinion	Additional Comments after reviewing all recommendations and providing an overall opinion
		by needs. Common Standards review at the more tightly-coupled administrative end might make more sense.
K-12 Role: Additional Comments after reviewing the individual recommendations		
0	-1	There are already enough test for teachers, classes, internships, etc for teacher to jump over. How about more money and support?
22.5	-2	I can not state that I support only because I am not knowledgeable regarding the total process used to develop the new system.
Public Role: Additional Comments after reviewing the individual recommendations		
8.5	-1	I just feel like the individual programs would lose out in the site reviews under the proposed system. I don't think that "paper" reviews are enough and that not ensuring team members with specific program expertise is unacceptable.

Comments about proposed system as a whole
Exp= Experience with accreditation
Overall Opinion= rating of the proposed system